

EXHIBIT F

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

Case No. 23-md-03084-CRB (LJC)

_____/

This Order Relates To:

ALL ACTIONS

**MASTER PRIVILEGE DETERMINATIONS
JUNE 17 CLAWBACK NOTICE**

October 7, 2025

Master Privilege Determinations
June 17 Clawback Notice
October 7, 2025

	Control Number	Privilege Assertion	Uber's Privilege Description	Plaintiff's Privilege Log Challenge Rationale	Master's Determination	Reasoning
1	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG006612	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
2	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG006613	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
3	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG006614	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
4	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG006714	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding interpretation of proposed legislation.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber withdrew its privilege claim during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
5	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG006832	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail thread seeking and providing legal advice from in-house counsel regarding interpretation of proposed legislation.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber withdrew its privilege claim during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
6	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007165	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
7	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007166	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
8	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007167	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.

Master Privilege Determinations
June 17 Clawback Notice
October 7, 2025

	Control Number	Privilege Assertion	Uber's Privilege Description	Plaintiff's Privilege Log Challenge Rationale	Master's Determination	Reasoning
9	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007475	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking and providing legal advice from in-house counsel regarding Uber's policies and practices for responding to allegations of driver sexual assault or sexual misconduct.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
10	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007476	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking and providing legal advice from in-house counsel regarding Uber's policies and practices for responding to allegations of driver sexual assault or sexual misconduct.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
11	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007513	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and produced with modified redactions since, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
12	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007515	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding Uber's policies and practices for responding to allegations of driver sexual assault or sexual misconduct.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
13	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007553	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber withdrew its privilege claim during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
14	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007554	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 3, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
15	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007555	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
16	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG007556	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking and memorializing legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver background check policies and practices.	Yes-this is a Tranche 1 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 3, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.

Master Privilege Determinations
June 17 Clawback Notice
October 7, 2025

	Control Number	Privilege Assertion	Uber's Privilege Description	Plaintiff's Privilege Log Challenge Rationale	Master's Determination	Reasoning
17	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG032674	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding media inquiry concerning sexual assault or sexual misconduct by driver.	Yes-this is a Tranche 2 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 3, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
18	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG039302	Attorney-Client	Redacted confidential e-mail thread seeking and providing legal advice from in-house counsel regarding Uber's policies and practices for responding to allegations of driver sexual assault or sexual misconduct.	Yes-this is a Tranche 2 entry and Uber modified the redactions during the Court ordered re-review, clawback is improper at this point in time.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, this document may not be clawed back.
19	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG110078	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail thread seeking and providing legal advice from in-house counsel regarding initiatives or campaigns to promote rider safety.	Yes-non-attorneys Fuldner and Hazelbaker are discussing a bill that was potentially to be passed regarding mass claims, no legal advice or means was discussed-simply how the bill would impact Uber's business. West only states the bill would be hard to stop because the White House needs a win-he does not provide legal advice. Document should be produced with lesser redactions - none to Fuldner's email and only last sentence in Hazelbaker's email, Please note Uber did not even clawback the Hazelbaker's email in UBER_JCCP_MDL_005439877	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, a substantially identical document (JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG006714) may not be clawed back. The same content may not be clawed back here. Additionally, the first redaction, which is distinct from the content in JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG006714, does not seek or convey legal advice. Uber is ordered to produce the document with the noted redactions removed.
20	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG110079	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding initiatives or campaigns to promote rider safety.	Yes-non-attorneys Fuldner and Hazelbaker are discussing a bill that was potentially to be passed regarding mass claims, no legal advice or means was discussed-simply how the bill would impact Uber's business.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, a substantially identical document (JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG006714) may not be clawed back. The same content may not be clawed back here.
21	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG110080	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding initiatives or campaigns to promote rider safety.	Yes-non-attorneys Fuldner and Hazelbaker are discussing a bill that was potentially to be passed regarding mass claims, no legal advice or means was discussed-simply how the bill would impact Uber's business.	Not Privileged	Pursuant to Order dated September 30, 2025, a substantially identical document (JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG006714) may not be clawed back. The same content may not be clawed back here.

Master Privilege Determinations
June 17 Clawback Notice
October 7, 2025

	Control Number	Privilege Assertion	Uber's Privilege Description	Plaintiff's Privilege Log Challenge Rationale	Master's Determination	Reasoning
22	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG110081	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding reports of driver sexual assault or sexual misconduct.	Yes-Holt's 4.29.2017 1:18 email redaction is improper. Uber's CEO Kalanick is asking a question and she provides a detailed response to his question, neither are attorneys. The main purpose of her email is not to seek legal advice but to provide a response to the CEO. Redaction of Fuldner's email is also improper, Fuldner is providing a response to the non-attorney, he simply states Binnings is leading a process on the legal side and is available to provide advice if needed- this is neither providing legal advice nor seeking legal advice.	Not Privileged	The redacted portions do not seek or convey legal advice. Uber has not met its burden to establish this document is privileged.
23	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG110099	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail thread provided for purposes of seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding driver deactivation policies and practices.	Yes-a non-attorney is providing her own opinion, then asks other non-attorneys thoughts. She then tags an attorney at the end of her email to ask for legal advice- she is simply tacking that line on the end in an email meant to discuss Uber's business process and how to improve Uber's brand.	Produce with Uber's Proposed Redactions	The redacted portions seek legal advice. Uber's redactions are appropriate.
24	JCCP_MDL_PRIVLOG110107	Attorney-Client	Confidential e-mail thread seeking legal advice from in-house counsel regarding in-app features to advance rider safety.	Yes-no legal advice is being sought in the email, it is a non-attorney providing an update and his priorities, and notes alignment is needed for external support-this email has a dominant business purpose and does not seek legal advice	Produce with New Redactions	This communication reflects both legal and business advice. Uber is ordered to produce with the legal advice redacted.